UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,346	02/01/2001	Yechiam Yemini	18704-018	7198

28089	7590	09/07/2004

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
300 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER
MILLS, DONALD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2662	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 February 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-89* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-89* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/01, 2/02, 1/03*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 63-89 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Regarding claim 63, the claim specifies *said destination node* (See claim 63, line 7.) The

limitation lacks proper antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 76, the claim specifies *said data* and *said foreign network* (See claim 76,

line 6.) Both limitations lack proper antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-4, 10, 21-23, 29, 35-37, 43, 49-51, 57, 63, 64, 70, 76, 77, 83, and 89 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bosack (US 5,088,032).

Regarding claims 1, 21, 36, 49, 63, and 76, Bosack discloses a method and apparatus for

routing communications among network computers, which comprises:

Each node is assigned a set of one or more coordinate labels, each representing a path comprising one or more links or other nodes (Referring to Figure 2, a gateway is initialized including a description (coordinate label) of each data link. See column 3, lines 66-67 and column 4, lines 3-9.)

Each coordinate label is unique to the Node to which it is assigned (Referring to Figure 2, by definition each description (coordinate label) is unique to each gateway. See column 4, lines 3-9.)

A path between a first Node and a second Node being determined from one of said coordinate labels associated with said first Node and one of said coordinate labels associated with said second Node (Referring to Figure 2, paths between the gateway and destinations are compiled based on the description of each data link between the gateway and destination. See column 5, lines 17-19.)

Said first Node is a gateway Node and said second Node is a destination Node (Referring to Figure 2, gateways and destinations.)

Data from a foreign network is received at said gateway Node and routed on said network to said destination Node (Referring to Figure 2, gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks where one could be considered foreign, such as, a land microwave network and a home network, such as, a satellite network for routing data between the gateway and destination. See column 3, lines 32-40.)

Regarding claim 2, Bosack discloses *wherein said received data is routed to a closest Node of a plurality of mirror Nodes* (Referring to Figure 2, traffic is sent along a path with a lower metric (a closest Node) of the subsequent intermediate nodes. See column 5, lines 44-50.)

Regarding claim 3, Bosack discloses *where said gateway Node translates said data from said foreign network into a local packet* (Referring to Figure 2, gateways, by definition translates data packets between foreign and local networks.)

Regarding claim 4, Bosack discloses *where said local packet is a DART packet* (Referring to Figure 2, the Examiner interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets.)

Regarding claims 10 and 64, Bosack discloses *where said data is a DART packet wrapped in a foreign packet, and where said gateway Node unwraps said DART packet from said foreign packet* (Referring to 2, the Examiner interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets, by definition a gateway translates data packets between local and foreign networks.)

Regarding claim 22, Bosack discloses *where said gateway Node translates said data into a foreign packet* (Referring to Figure 2, gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks where one could be considered foreign, such as, a land microwave network and a home network, such as, a satellite network for routing data between the gateway and destination. See column 3, lines 32-40.)

Regarding claim 23, Bosack discloses *where said foreign packet is a DART packet* (Referring to Figure 2, the Examiner interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets.)

Regarding claims 29, 51, and 77, Bosack discloses *where said gateway Node wraps a DART packet in a foreign packet to form said data* (Referring to Figure 2, the Examiner

interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets, by definition a gateway translates data packets between local and foreign networks.)

Regarding claims 35 and 89, Bosack discloses *where said transmission from said gateway Node into said foreign network is performed by a Link Label replacement* (Referring to Figure 2, a gateway is initialized including a description (coordinate label) of each data link which is different for each gateway. See column 3, lines 66-67 and column 4, lines 3-9.)

Regarding claim 37, Bosack discloses *unwrapping a foreign packet from said data to recover a DART packet* (Referring to Figure 2, the Examiner interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets, by definition a gateway translates data packets between local and foreign networks.)

Regarding claims 43 and 70, Bosack discloses *translating said data received from said foreign network into a DART packet* (Referring to Figure 2, the Examiner interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets, by definition a gateway translates data packets between local and foreign networks.)

Regarding claim 50, Bosack discloses *where said transmission from said destination Node into said foreign network is performed by a Link Label replacement* (Referring to Figure 2, a gateway is initialized including a description (coordinate label) of each data link which is different for each gateway. See column 3, lines 66-67 and column 4, lines 3-9.)

Regarding claims 57 and 83, Bosack discloses *forming said data by translating a DART packet into a foreign packet* (Referring to Figure 2, the Examiner interprets packets received by the gateway as DART packets, by definition a gateway translates data packets between local and foreign networks.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 5-9, 11-20, 24-28, 30-34, 38-42, 44-48, 52-56, 58-62, 65-69, 71-75, 78-82, and

84-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosack (US 5,088,032).

Regarding claim 5 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Bosack discloses all

of the claim limitations of claim 1 (parent claim).

Bosack does not disclose *where said local packet is an IP packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an IP packet

based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claim 6 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Bosack discloses all

of the claim limitations of claim 1 (parent claim).

Bosack does not disclose *where said local packet is an Appletalk packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an

Appletalk packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claim 7 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Bosack discloses all

of the claim limitations of claim 1 (parent claim).

Bosack does not disclose *where said local packet is an Ethernet packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an Ethernet

packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claim 8 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Bosack discloses all

of the claim limitations of claim 1 (parent claim).

Bosack does not disclose *where said local packet is a MPLS packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement a MPLS packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claim 9 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of claim 1 (parent claim).

Bosack does not disclose *where said local packet is an ATM packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an ATM packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 11, 24, 30, 38, 52, 65, 71, 78, and 84 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *where said foreign packet is an IP packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an IP packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 12, 25, 31, 39, 53, 66, 72, 79, and 87 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *where said foreign packet is an Appletalk packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an Appletalk packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 13, 26, 32, 40, 54, 67, 73, and 80 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *where said foreign packet is an Ethernet packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an Ethernet packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 14, 27, 33, 41, 55, 68, 74, 81, and 85 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *where said foreign packet is a MPLS packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an MPLS

packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claim 15, 28, 34, 42, 56, 69, 75, 82, and 86 as explained in the rejection

statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *where said foreign packet is an ATM packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an ATM

packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 16, 44, and 58 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent

claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *wherein said data received from said foreign network is an IP*

packet.

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an IP packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 17, 45, and 59 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *wherein said data received from said foreign network is a MPLS packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement a MPLS packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 18, 46, and 60 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *wherein said data received from said foreign network is an ATM packet.*

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an ATM

packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 19, 47, and 61 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent

claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *wherein said data received from said foreign network is an*

Appletalk packet.

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an

Appletalk packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Regarding claims 20, 48, and 62 as explained in the rejection statement of the parent

claim; Bosack discloses all of the claim limitations of the parent claims.

Bosack does not disclose *wherein said data received from said foreign network is an*

Ethernet packet.

Bosack teaches routing communications among network computers comprising

gateways, which by definition interconnect two networks, such as, a land microwave network

and a satellite network (See column 3, lines 32-40.)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement an Ethernet

packet based network in the system of Bosack. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to conform to such a well-known standard.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Donald L Mills whose telephone number is 571-272-3094. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 703-305-4744. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Donald L Mills

September 6, 2004

JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER